
From: Rod Cameron [mailto:rodcam@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:19 PM
To: Milton, John
Subject: Improving 520

The Pacific Street Interchange option is, so far, too vague for meaningful comment. It seems likely to have a profound and negative impact on important parts of the UW campus, on the environment of Husky Stadium and on Marsh Island and other important parts of the Arboretum and Foster Island areas. Foster Island is already profoundly impacted by the current routing of SR520. The road's noise currently impacts and degrades many surrounding neighborhoods including Montlake, Madison Park, Roanoke, North Capital Hill and Laurelhurst. A six lane replacement, without effective mitigation measures, can only worsen these impacts.

I believe any choice should give serious attention to the following:

I-1250-001 | 1. Noise impact: sound absorbing roadway surfaces should be employed even if such surfaces are less durable than concrete which seems to be the the loudest surface, particularly when it ages and becomes worn. Sound barriers should be erected on the sides of the bridge to both absorb sound and direct it away from inhabited areas.

I-1250-002 | 2. As is now established beyond contention, increased roadway capacity simply breeds more cars and trucks until the additional capacity is used up and yet more capacity is needed. The Pacific Street Interchange idea, for example, will simply bring more traffic into a corridor that cannot bear it without far more extensive infrastructure "improvements" north of the Interchange along Montlake Boulevard, 25th Ave. NE, 35th Ave. NE, 40th Ave. NE, NE 45th St., Sand Point Way and west of the Interchange along Pacific St., NE Northlake Way, etc. The choke points currently experienced along Montlake Blvd. and Pacific St. during many hours of every day will simply move northwards, northeastwards, and westwards. When these effects become more widely known, the potential for the Pacific St. Interchange to become another R.H. Thompson Freeway debacle will grow.

The remnants of the R.H.Thompson Freeway still stand in this very area after 35 years, an eyesore and of use only to teenagers looking for a thrill in jumping off the ramps into the Lake. The Montlake neighborhood and many neighborhoods to the south of it brought that project to a halt and those same neighborhoods may again rise up once the impact of improved access to 520 from the south of all the proposals being considered are fully appreciated. The choke points, like those to the north, will simply move southwards along Lake Washington Blvd., 24th/23rd Avenues NE, etc. And this despite the fact that the Pacific St. Interchange idea originated with the Montlake group, Better Bridge. This time, if such south of 520 neighborhoods come into opposition, they will be joined by the neighborhoods to the north and northeast that are already being energised to oppose the Pacific St. Interchange idea.

I-1250-003 | 3. Any new 520 bridge should include extensive built-in compatibility for exclusive bus lanes, rail mass transit and bicycle use. The era of the single occupancy vehicle is, and should be, coming to an end. Bridge tolls should reflect that, charging more for single occupancy vehicles than for carpools, charging more for use during periods of high demand (peak load pricing), etc. And the tolls should pay for a higher proportion of the cost of the Evergreen Point Bridge replacement. Let the users of the facility pay for it. That is simply good market economics.

I-1250-004 | 4. High priority should be given to mitigating the ill effects of this project on the Washington Park Arboretum, Foster Island and Marsh Island and their associated wetlands.

Respectfully,
Roderick A. Cameron
3419 E Laurelhurst Dr. NE
Seattle, Wa 98105
206-524-4434

I-1250-001

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1250-002

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1250-003

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1250-004

Comment Summary:

Fish and Wildlife (Mitigation)

Response:

See Section 16.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.